

### REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 4, 2007. Claims 1-5 and 7-10 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1 and 10 are in independent form. Claim 6 has been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein. Claims 1-5 and 7-10 have been amended to define Applicant's invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0170973 (Teraura); and that Claims 4, 5, and 8 are rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Teraura in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,958,221 (Tsuboi et al.). Cancellation of Claim 6 renders its rejection moot. Applicant submits that independent Claims 1 and 10 together with the remaining claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to a contents information printing system that prints contents information to an identifiable recording medium. The system includes an identification device, first and second determination devices, an inhibiting device, and a print device. The identification device identifies identification information of a recording medium to which contents information is to be printed. The first determination device determines whether or not printing of the contents information to the recording medium is permitted based on the identification information identified by the identification device. If it is determined by the first determination device that printing to the recording medium is not permitted, the inhibiting device inhibits printing of the contents

information to the recording medium. If the first determination device determines that printing to the recording medium is permitted, the second determination device determines whether or not the contents information, which is designated for printing, has been registered. The print device prints the contents information designated for printing to the recording medium, based on a determination by the second determination device.

According to Claim 1, identification information of a recording medium to which contents information is to be printed is identified and used to determine whether printing of the contents information to the recording medium is permitted. If printing is not permitted, the printing of the contents information to the recording medium is inhibited. If printing is permitted, it is determined whether the contents information to be printed to the recording medium has been registered. Thus, on the basis of the above, printing of the contents information is performed.

Teraura relates to a sheet of printing paper having an RFID tag incorporated therein. Teraura teaches that data may be detected from the RFID tag and used to control the operations of a copy/facsimile machine. More specifically, Teraura is understood to teach that, if received data does not include RFID data to be written to an RFID tag 14, a sheet of printing paper without an RFID tag (“usual” printing paper) is selected to be used for printing. See paragraph [0081]. On the other hand, if the received data includes RFID data, e.g., software data transmitted from a personal computer 39, then a sheet of printing paper 13 having an RFID tag 14 is selected and the RFID data is stored in the RFID tag 14 and an image including characters and figures is printed on the sheet of printing paper 13. See paragraph [0083].

Teraura also is understood to teach that, when a sheet of document paper 61 has no RFID tag, i.e., the sheet is “usual,” an image with characters and figures read by a scanner 6 is printed on a usual sheet. See paragraph [0086]. However, if the sheet of document paper 61 has an RFID tag 14, data in the RFID tag 14 is read and stored, and an image with characters, figures, photo images, read from the sheet of paper 61 is printed on a sheet of printing paper 13 after an authentication process for printing takes place. See paragraphs [0087] to [0092].

Additionally, Teraura is understood to disclose that, if an ID number inputted by an operator matches a stored ID number, when data on a sheet of document paper 61 with an RFID tag 14 is to be printed, data read from the RFID tag 14 of the sheet of document paper 61 and the ID number are stored in an RFID tag 14 of a sheet of printing paper 13. See paragraph [0092].

Nothing has been found in Teraura that is believed to teach or suggest a contents information printing system that prints contents information to an identifiable recording medium, wherein the system includes “a first determination device that determines whether or not printing of the contents information to the recording medium is permitted based on the identification information identified by the identification device,” and “an inhibiting device that inhibits printing of the contents information to the recording medium, if it is determined by the first determination device that printing to the recording medium is not permitted,” as recited in Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that Teraura is silent regarding inhibiting printing based on a determination of whether identification information indicates that such printing is permitted. In fact, the Office Action apparently concedes that Teraura does not disclose inhibiting the printing of a document under certain conditions. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not

anticipated by Teraura and therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Independent Claim 10 includes features similar to those of Claim 1, discussed above, and therefore is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in this application depend from Claim 1 and therefore are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Tsuboi et al. relates to a digital color copying machine. This reference is understood to disclose that the copying machine stores image data corresponding to a partial area of an original image, and forms a plurality of test images of the partial area based on the stored image data, the plurality of test images having different color balances. See column 2, lines 57-64. However, Tsuboi et al. is not seen to teach or suggest anything that would remedy the deficiencies of Teraura.

Applicant submits that a combination of Teraura and Tsuboi et al., assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest a contents information printing system and method that prints contents information to an identifiable recording medium, in which it is determined whether or not printing of contents information to a recording medium is permitted based on identification information identified by a identification device, and in which printing of the contents information to the recording medium is inhibited when it is determined that printing to the recording medium is not permitted, as claimed in independent Claims 1 and 10.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 1-5 and 7-10 are patentable over any permissible combination of Teraura and Tsuboi et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/  
Lock See Yu-Jahnes  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS\_WS 1948306v1